

REMARKS

This paper is presented in response to the Examiner's Office Action mailed December 16, 2003. Claim 1 has been amended. Claims 1, 2, and 4 through 8 remain pending. Claims 11-14 were withdrawn by the Examiner as being drawn to a non-elected species. This withdrawal is respectfully traversed in Section III below.

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. For the convenience and reference of the Examiner, the remarks of the Applicant are presented in the order in which the corresponding issues were raised in the Office Action.

I. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Applicant respectfully notes at the outset that in order to establish anticipation under 35 U.S.C. §102, it is the burden of the Examiner to demonstrate that the reference teaches every element of the claim. "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." (See MPEP §2131) Claims 1 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,554,621 issued to *Margalit et al.* ("Margalit"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

With respect to claim 1, applicant can find no information in the specification, claims, or drawings of the *Margalit* reference that supports the Examiner's assertion that *Margalit* shows "a peripheral interface (B) enabled to allow the attachment of the peripheral (adaptor A) in (two) different orientations" (bold added), as recited in claim 1. *Margalit* teaches an extension cable that runs from the rear of a computer to some remote location. Socket 100 is identical to socket 120 (Fig. 3). The extension cable can be attached to a surface using a cable end adherent 130 (Fig. 3). The only two types of cables specifically discussed are USB cables and Firewire cables.

Both of these cables connect in one and only one orientation. This is also true of standard serial and parallel cable/socket connectors. The *Margalit* device is simply an extension cable with a suction cup on one end.

In contrast, the adaptor of claim 1 is specifically designed to allow the connection of the peripheral device in multiple physical orientations. For example, with respect to Figure 2 of the application, peripheral device 30 plugs directly into custom adapter 24. If the custom adapter is rotated 90 degrees (reference numeral 24'), peripheral device 30 still plugs directly into the adapter. This is equally true with respect to custom adapter 24'' and 24''', which are rotated 180 degrees and 270 degrees, respectively.

It is physically impossible for current socket/plug combinations to achieve this functionality. All current plug designs, including USB, PS2, serial, parallel, Firewire, SVGA, and so on, can connect in one and only one physical orientation. If one rotates any of the plugs 90 degrees with respect to their sockets, the plug cannot be inserted into the socket. In order to clarify this relationship, applicant has amended claim 1 to positively recite "a peripheral interface enabled to allow the attachment of the peripheral in different physical orientations". Since the *Margalit* reference fails to teach each and every claim element recited in claim 1, claim 1 as amended is, therefore patentable over the *Margalit* reference. Applicant therefore believes that, in light of the above arguments, claim 1 as amended patentably distinguishes over the cited art, either alone or in combination. Therefore, claims 2, 4, and 5-8, dependent therefrom, also patentably distinguish over the cited art. Immediate allowance of all pending claims is, therefore, respectfully requested.

If the Examiner disagrees with applicant's assessment of the *Margalit* reference with respect to claim 1, applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner provide specific information

(i.e. column and line number) that shows where the *Margalit* reference lists each of the claim elements recited in claim 1. This would allow applicant to more clearly and completely address these rejections.

**II. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

The Examiner has rejected claim 2, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. 6,554,621 issued to *Margalit et al.* ("*Margalit*") in view of U.S. 4,932,902 issued to Crane, Jr. ("*Crane*"). The Examiner rejected claims 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Margalit*. Finally, the Examiner rejected claims and 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Margalit* in view of U.S. 5,880,721 issued to Yen ("*Yen*"). However, since Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over the references cited above, claims 2, and 4-8 are also patentable. These rejections are therefore moot.

**III. Election of Species & Traverse**

Applicant acknowledges the withdrawal of claims 11 through 13 by the Examiner, and Examiner's comments in paragraph 8 of the Office Action. However, Applicant does not contend that "the peripheral interface 24 as shown in figure 2 has the same structure as the peripheral interface 25 as shown in figure 4", as stated by the Examiner. Such a contention is not necessary. Applicant submits that claim 11, as written, is generic as defined by MPEP §806.04(d), and that therefore, such restriction is improper.

Applicant respectfully submits that the restriction requirement made by the Examiner is improper because claims 11 through 13 specifically read on Species I (Figures 1-3e). In particular, the "digital device having an interface with a specified orientation" recited in claim 11

(emphasis added) does not read on a USB, as the Examiner suggests but, instead, reads on digital devices such as are exemplified by the computer 10 indicated in Figure 1. In this regard, as stated in the previous response, Applicant submits that it is well known that Uniform Serial Bus ("USB") refers to a particular type of interface, rather than to a "digital device" such as is recited in claim 11. In addition to the aforementioned digital device illustrated in Figure 1, claim 11 also recites a "peripheral device" 30 (Figure 1), a "connector" 24 (Figure 1), and an "orienting coupling interface" 26 (Figure 1).

Since the claim is generic, Applicant submits that examination of Claim 11, and claims 12-14 dependent therefrom, is proper in the current application. Additionally, by the Examiner's own admission, claims 12 and 14 are generic (*see paragraph 1 of Office Action dated March 12, 2003*). For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the restriction made by the Examiner concerning claims 11 through 13 is improper and Applicant, accordingly, traverses such restriction.

Applicant therefore submits that claims 1, 2, and 4-8 patentably distinguish over the cited art. Immediate allowance of these pending claims is therefore respectfully requested. Applicant also once again reiterates that that the restriction of claims 11-13 is improper. Additionally, Applicant believes that claims 11-14 also patentably distinguish over the references of record. Applicant therefore respectfully requests the reinstatement and immediate allowance of claims 11-14, as well.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 16 day of June, 2004.

Respectfully submitted,



Eric L. Maschoff  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 36,596  
Customer No. 022913

W:\11960\3112\JLK000000167V001.DOC